Notice of a motion *re:* the reported Statement of the Chief Minister on the Cauvery Waters

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall certainly give the ruling.

† Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have submitted a motion under Rule 146 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislature Assembly. The motion reads as :

> "This House is of opinion that the Chief Minister has abdicated the rights and interests of Mysore State in Cauvery Waters by holding out an assurance to the Government of India and the Government of Tamil Nadu that he would faithfully implement the 1892 and 1924 Agreements in contravention of the stand taken earlier by the State Government."

Sir, you will please remember that I have raised an Adjournment Motion in the last session when the Chief Minister was reported to have given such an assurance to the Government of Madras during the meeting held on 20th August 1968 at New Delhi.

On 20th August 1968 at New Delhi that assurance is said to have been given. Subsequent to that, when I raised this question by way of an adjournment motion, the Hon'ble Chief Minister is this House refused to say yes or no to my question. That roused grave doubts as to his own conduct in this matter. Then this House was moved by the Chief Minister to consider this matter at a meeting.

4-00 P.M.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—On a point of order, Sir. The Hon'ble Member Sri H. M. Channabasappa in his motion is seeking Chair's consent under rule 146, but has not said when exactly this assurance has been given. But he was pleased to point out that such an assurance was reported to have been given by the Chief Minister on 20th August 1969. Sir, I would like to bring to your kind notice, Rule 148 (4) which says :

> "It shall be restricted to a matter of recent occurrence"

It is very clear that the reported assurance is not of recent occurrence. The Hon'ble Member has plenty of time to send a resolution in the normal course. Therefore Sir, under Rule 148 (4) the resolution for which he is seeking your consent, to be taken up under rule 146, is out of order.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I would like to clarify the position. The Hon'ble Minister is on wrong premises. In the letter itself I have said that this pertains to a matter of recent occurrence as was disclosed by the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu recently. Therefore, the Minister is on wrong premises. I am sorry the Minister is in unchaste haste !

Sir, I referred to the reported statement of the Chief Minister of Tamilu Nadu made on 13th September 1969 in which he says:

> "Mr. Patil then gave an aasurance that the two agreements would be faithfully implemented and Tamil Nadu would continue to share its water according to the formula which would be respected."

There are other things which I do not want to read because it will take the time of the House.

Therefore, the Chief Mlnister has made an assurance according to the reported statement of the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister on the floor of the Madras Assembly, to the effect that the Chief Minister of Mysore has made it clear to the Government of India and also to the Tamil Nadu Government that he would faithfully implement the 1924 Agreement. Now I recall to your memory, that in 1959 the Minister for Public Works of the Government of Mysore had told this Assembly that on account of the various facts set out, this Government has taken the stand that we do not agree with the 1924 Agreement and it has got to be revised and we have moved the Government of India to appoint a tribunal under the Agreement. I do not want to go into details of the merits of the case. Suffice it to say that the interests of Mysore will be totally lost if such an assuraunce has been given by the Chief Minister of Madras. On the one side there is a report of 1959 of the Anantachar Committee. There is also report of mine. There is the decision and the report of the Technical Committee appointed by the Government of Mysore in regard to Cauvery waters. All of them have unanimously reported that the rules of regulations and also the agreement of 1924 have to be revised.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Will the Hon. Member please tell me how it is a matter of recent occurrence. He says an assurance has been given by the Chief Minister. When was it given according to the hon. Member?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—This is on 13-9-1969.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot accept that as evidence. What appears in newspaper is not a matter of evidence. Therefore, I want to know from the hon. Member the date on which the assurance was given.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, I have also submitted it to your Secretary. In addition to this I requested the Legislature office to write to the Legislature office of Tamil Nadu and obtain for me an authentic copy of the proceedings of that Assembly so that I could place it before you.

Mr. SPEAKER.—According to the hon. Member, this assurance was given by the Chief Minister. What is the date of that assurance? About the reference in the Madras Assembly, it is a different thing.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I do not know. The Government must tell me when he gave that assurance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member does not know when this assurance was given ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Secondly, has the hon. Member got any *prima facie* proof to say that such an assurance was given ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—When the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, a man of status who matters in this country, makes a statement on the floor of the Legislative Assembly of Madras, I have no alternative to say that he has made a correct statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I know from the hon. Member whether he is depending upon this newspaper report stating that the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister made the statement.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then may I know from the Hon. Chief Minister whether such an assurance was given.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Chief Minister).—Sir, The hon. Member, it appears, is depending too much upon the statement that has been made by the Hon. Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu. I do not know what statement, he has made; and if he has made any statement, I do not know how I will be responsible for that statement. I am very sorry to say that the hon. Member wanted to know from me whether any such assurance was given by me in the Conference that was held in Delhi in the month of August 1968. He wrote a letter too and then I sent a reply too. When I have sent a reply to him and in that reply whatever I wanted to say I have already stated, and if he wanted to raise anything and everything on the floor of the House, there was no need for him to write the letter or seek clarification or explanation from me. Even now if he wants to know anything from the Government, he can put a Short Notice Question; I am prepared to reply to the Short Notice Question. If he is not satisfied with the reply furnished on the floor of the House, nothing prevents him from raising Half-an-hour Discussion. Just because the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has stated something, the hon. Member wants to pick up a quarrel and haul me up. I do not think there is any case for him. I do not think there is any stuff in what Sri Channabasappa is saying.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Mr. Speaker Sir, before your goodself would give a ruling, I am extremely sorry to say that he is trying to play hide and seek. It is such a simple matter. He can say whether he has given an assurance or not, not in my interest but in the interest of the State. He refers to my letter. Whenever I write anything to him, he replies in an evasive way which may be on this side as well as that side. I have stated in the House that he is an expert in side-tracking. He is an expert in rope walking. I have given this compliment to him. This is a matter concerning the State interests. Let him please tell this House, which is a responsible House representing 2½

crores of people, whether he has given such an assurance or not? If this House is not competent to know that information, I do not know who else is competent. The action of the State Chief Minister either this way or that way will either ruin the country or will uphold the State's interests. Such being the case, I fail to understand him. Yesterday he stated: I am second to none in safeguarding the interests of the State: I want him to be second to none. Therefore in such an important matter affecting the interests of the State, how can he keep this House and the people of Mysore in ignorance? The matter has been reported both from Delhi and from Tamil Nadu. But the Chief Minister of Mysore refuses to make a statement whether he agreed orally or in writing that he would agree to faithfully implement the 1924 and 1892 Agreements, Instead of directly answering, he asks me to bring a Short Notice Question or raise Half-an-hour Discussion. I am asking straight through you and through this motion if he says: I have not made any such commitments; then I have no quarrel. On the other hand, I must congratulate him. Instead of receiving congratulation from me for making a statement that either by implication or in writing he has not created an impression of that kind, he is evading. Let him say, "I have upheld the interests of the State." I will be the first to congratulate him. Instead of making such a statement and removing the doubts in the minds of the Members and the country, he is telling me through you that I may bring this motion and that motion. This is simply side-tracking. There is a proverb in Kannada : ಬೀಸುವ ದೊಣ್ಣೆಗೆ ತಲೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿದರೆ ಸಾವಿರ ವರ್ಷ ಆಯುಷ್ಯ. If you could escape now, let us see later on tomorrow! That is not the way. In the interests of the State, it is not fit for a Chief Minister to say so; it may be all right as Sri Veerendra Patil.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I rise on a point of order. 148ನೇ ರೂಲ್ 4ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾನು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಎತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ "ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ನಡೆದ ಘಟನೆಗಳಾಗಿರಬೇಕು" ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಚಾಪ್ಟರ್ 15ರಲ್ಲಿ "ಯಾವ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ 15 ದಿವಸದ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಕಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು" ಇದೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು, ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದರ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದು 19ನೇ ಸೆಪ್ಟಂಬರ್ 1969 ಎಂದು. ಅಂದರೆ 4 ತಿಂಗಳ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿದೆ. 15ನೇ ಚಾಪ್ಟರ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು 4 ತಿಂಗಳ ಮುಂಚೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಕಳಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆಗ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆಗಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು 16ನೇ ಚಾಪ್ಟರ್ 146ನೇ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ರೂಲ್ 148, ಸಬ್ ರೂಲ್ 4 ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅದು ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಸಭೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು 19ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿಗೆ. 15 ದಿನ ಅಂದರೆ, 4-5ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಚಿನ ಘಟನೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇತ್ತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ರೂಲ್ 148, ಸಬ್‌ರೂಲ್ 4ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹೆಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ, 146 ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇಲ್ಲ, ಮತ್ತು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall consider and give my ruling. Now, if my impression is correct, the Hon. Chief Minister made a reference to a letter which Sri Channabasappa addressed to him in this context. Will Sri Channabasappa tell me the contents of that letter?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have not got the letter at this moment.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—I have got a copy of that letter before me Sir.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—When I am speaking he is rising to speak.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—On the other hand, the hon. Member is in the habit of doing it.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—He has exhibited it now. The Chief Minister should give a certain amount of dignity befitting the office he holds.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon. Member should have a sense of responsibility towards others.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, you know that I do not ordinarily interfere. If I begin to speak I do not tolerate any other's interference.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—Did not the member do it yesterday?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I take objection.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, even when he interferes it is objectionable.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is better to leave these matters at that.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I asked for a specific answer. If he reads my letter along with his letter, I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request the hon. Member to give his letter.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, he must read my letter. He must read what information I have asked for and in juxtaposition he must read the letter he has replied. If that is done the House will be in a position to understand the position. Otherwise if he reads his letter only, it has no meaning. Let him read my letter first and let the House know what information I had asked for.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member can give me a copy of his letter.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have not kept it with me. Let him give it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Can you give that?

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—Let the hon. member give a copy of his letter written to me and I will give a copy of my letter to you. The Speaker can decide.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have written a letter requesting for certain information. The reply by the Chief Minister should have some relevance to the information I had asked for. If I ask something and if the reply is something else, it has no meaning. This House

should not be misled. Therefore let a copy of my letter and his letter be placed on the Table of the House and let the House decide whether it is deceitful or not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not in good taste to use such words.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like the member to find out whether he has a copy of the letter written by him to the Chief Minister.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Excuse me, Sir, I have no copy of that letter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I know the hon. Member is having compilation of all the letters. He may find out, and give me the original tomorrow.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have not got my letter. He has a copy. Let him supply it to you and to me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request the Chief Minister to give me the necessary information. After taking that into consideration I shall give my ruling.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—When shall I expect your ruling ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Tomorrow I shall get the papers. Now Sri V. N. Patil will proceed to his Calling Attention notice.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—Yesterday you were good enough to promise that you will take up the notice regarding Bangalore Water Supply Tender scandal.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. You have ruled that once a member is called, he alone can speak. You called Sri V. N. Patil.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I uphold the point of order. Sri Patil will proceed.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Calling Attenton to a matter of urgent public importance *re*: Arbitrary disconnection of the Electricity Service Connections in Humnabad Town.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—While Calling the Attention of the Chief Minister I would like to state one or two facts so that the Chief Minister will know the points I have in mind. There were more than 15 electricity disconnections in Humnabad Town on the ground that the consumers were defaulters and did not pay the amount. For the last three years they are paying regularly the monthly demand. One consumer has been served with a notice to pay Rs. 800 and in respect of another ordinary shop keeper a demand of Rs. 600 is made in spite of the fact that they are regularly paying. There seems to be something wrong. I want to request the Chief Minister to see that if the consumers are subsequently found due—there was no fault on the part of the consumers–the demand